



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/850,184	05/07/2001	Randy Buswell	Wyse-006	9750

31824 7590 11/24/2004

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
18191 VON KARMAN AVE.
IRVINE, CA 92612-7107

EXAMINER

BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/850,184	Applicant(s) BUSWELL ET AL.	
	Examiner Kevin Bates	Art Unit 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 20-25 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) * | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on May 7, 2004.

The Declaration was received on January 10, 2002.

The Power of Attorney was received on May 17, 2003 and December 19, 2003.

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-19 are drawn to a method of managing configuration information in a thin client network, classified in class 709, subclass 220.

II. Claims 20-25 are drawn to a method of finding devices on a thin client network, classified in class 709, subclass 224.

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention Group II has separate utility such as adding thin clients into a network for access to network resources. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mark Itri on November 17, 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of managing configuration information in a thin client network, claims 1-19. Affirmation of this

election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 20-25 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Objections

Claim 7 objected to because of the following informalities: the examiner can read the claim to be two separate meanings. Meaning 1, where the address is a server address that allows the thin client to connect to the server and obtain certain parts of the registry, each field is individually linked to, and Meaning 2, where each field is separately entered and can be dealt with individually, address each field separately. For the purpose of further prosecution, the examiner is going to assume that the claim means that each field can be dealt with separately. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Capps (6735691).

Regarding claims 1, 6, and 14, Capps discloses a computer utility for managing configuration information (Column 2, lines 3 – 5) by registry flying in a thin client network

(Column 3, lines 48 – 53), comprising: a plurality of thin client devices connected via a plurality of communications links to the thin client network (Figure 1, element 106 and 108), each thin client device capable of receiving and serving requests connected via one of the communications links to the thin client network (Column 3, lines 53 – 55), each thin client device having a current registry containing configuration information (Column 4, lines 3 – 7); a master thin client device registry containing configuration information changed from the current registry of any one of the plurality of thin client devices (Column 3, lines 57 – 62); any one of the thin client devices capable of serving a request to either a software repository or another thin client device to pull the master thin client device registry stored on either the software repository or the other thin client device; either the software repository or the other thin client device capable of replicating the master thin client registry and transporting the master thin client registry via a transport mechanism to one or more of the plurality of thin client devices (Column 4, lines 9 – 22).

Regarding claims 2 and 17, Capps discloses that the transport mechanism selected from the group consisting File Transport Protocol, Trivial File Transport Protocol and other Internet protocols (Column 3, lines 16 – 19).

Regarding claims 5 and 13, Capps discloses that the configuration information in the master thin client device registry is an upgrade for a binary or a registry (Column 7, lines 35 – 42).

Regarding claim 7, Capps discloses that the master thin client device registry having a plurality of fields, each of the plurality of field capable of being individually addressed (Column 7, lines 50 – 54).

Regarding claim 8, Capps discloses at least one of the plurality of thin client devices having a native user interface for creating the master thin client device registry (Column 7, lines 45 – 50).

Regarding claim 9, Capps discloses a Virtual Network Computing client and server, the software repository or the thin client device storing the master thin client device registry (Column 8, lines 16 – 22) being in communication with the Virtual Network Computing client which provides a remote interface for creating the master thin client device registry (Column 7, lines 45 – 50), the Virtual Network Computing client communicates with the Virtual Network Computing server to make changes to the master thin client device registry through shadowing of the interface of the thin client device (Column 8, lines 9 – 15), where there is no functional difference between a VNC client and server, and an actual client-server interaction.

Regarding claim 10, Capps discloses that the thin client device storing the master thin client device registry provides a Hypertext Markup Language server that is used to create the master thin client device registry (Column 8, lines 1 – 15), the Hypertext Markup Language server provides a web page that reflects the configuration parameters of the master thin client device registry (Column 7, lines 45 – 50), a browser is used to make permanent changes to the configuration parameters of the master thin client device registry that is reflected on the web page (Column 5, lines 51 – 59).

Regarding claim 12, Capps discloses that the thin client device storing the master thin client device registry is a non-native device to the thin client network (Column 3, lines 48 – 55), a browser connects across the thin client network to communicate with the non-native device providing an Hypertext Markup Language server having one or more web pages therein (Column 5, lines 51 – 59; Column 7, lines 45 – 50), the Hypertext Markup Language server is in communication with the master thin client device registry through an application layer that is used to create the master thin client device registry (Column 8, lines 1 – 15).

Regarding claim 15, Capps discloses that the second one of the thin client devices is capable of replicating the master thin client registry and transporting the master thin client registry via a transport mechanism to one or more of the plurality of thin client devices (Column 4, lines 9 – 22).

Regarding claim 16, Capps discloses that the master thin client registry is merged with the current registry of one or more of the thin client devices from a first one of the plurality of thin client devices to create a merged thin client device registry (Column 8, lines 31 – 43).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capps in view of Dean (6202206).

Regarding claims 4 and 19, Capps does not explicitly indicate that the transport of the changed registry to one or more of the plurality of thin client devices is simultaneous to all selected thin client devices. Dean teaches configuring many selected client computers in the same network at once using a server to distribute information based on configure files (Column 5, lines 47 – 53; Column 6, lines 10 – 14; Column 10, lines 35 – 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Dean's teaching of distributing configuration information to many clients at once in Capps configuration migration system in order to allow many global configuration upgrades and computer installation in a short amount of time to reduce downtime (Column 1, lines 50 – 67).

Claims 3, 11, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capps in view of Carcerano (6308205).

Regarding the claims 3, 11, and 18, Capps does not explicitly indicate that the transport mechanism is triggered by Simple Network Management Protocol. Carcerano teaches a system that monitors and updates configuration information in devices, such as thin clients (Column 5, lines 13 – 20; Column 2, lines 13 – 26) and part of that teaching, Carcerano discloses using SNMP for communication between the clients and the servers (Column 9, lines 3 – 22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use SNMP to communicate and trigger the transfer mechanism in Capps system because SNMP is allows the servers to view

and update configurations of network devices without using excess traffic burdens
(Column 1, lines 56 – 59).

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No. 6029246 issued to Bahr, because it discloses updating the registries of clients in a network.

U. S. Patent No. 6370646 issued to Goodman, because it discloses migrating registry information to multiple clients.

U. S. Patent No. 5920863 issued to McKeehan, because it discloses a thin client network.

U. S. Patent No. 6110229 issued to Yamaguchi, because it discloses duplicating registration information on clients in a network.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB
November 18, 2004


HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER